

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated September 17, 2008. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of elected Claims 1-6 as anticipated by Ries, et al. In the Office Action the Examiner took the position that the recitation “for an electric device comprising a cathode-ray tube or a flat screen” related to intended use and was not given patentable weight. In order to address this, Claim 1 has been amended to replace “for” with “of” so that the claim is, in fact, directed to a casing on an electronic device and thus the electronic device is not an intended use of the invention, but, in fact, is part of the claimed invention. Thus, parent Claim 1 relates to a special casing – namely “a casing of an electronic device comprising a cathode-ray tube or a flat screen” is claimed. Therefore, this feature should have a patentable weight.

Ries, et al. disclose a hollow modelled article (such as a container) which can be used e.g. for switches. However, Ries et al. do not disclose that the casing can be used as a casing for an electronic device comprising a cathode-ray tube or a flat screen.

Furthermore, Ries et al. disclose a thermoplastic comprising a mixture of one polyamide and a polyamine-polamide copolymer. According to the present invention, a polyamide is a homopolymer and not a copolymer from different monomers, some of which are used as monomers of a polyamide. Therfore, Ries, et al. do also not disclose a thermoplastic which comprises a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity. Furthermore, even if different polymers are used, these may have the same solution viscosity. That the different polymers have different solution viscosities is not disclosed by Ries, et al.

Therefore, amended Claim 1 clearly distinguishes over Ries et al.

Since there is also no hint or suggestion given by Ries et al. for using the polymer for a casing of an electronic device comprising a cathode-ray tube or a flat screen, and Ries et al. further give no hint that the characteristics of the thermoplastic fulfill the requirements of a

material which can be used for a casing of an electronic device comprising a cathode-ray tube or a flat screen, a person skilled in the art would not use the described polymer for such a casing.


Therefore, amended Claim 1 would not be obvious from Ries et al.

Applicants also incorporate by reference hereto the arguments made in the Amendment of June 25, 2008, regarding differences from the invention and Ries et al.

In view of the above it is respectfully submitted that this application should be passed to issue.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Harold Pezzner

Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
Correspondence Customer Number: 23416
Attorney for Applicant

646281